

From: [Niemi, Cheryl \(ECY\)](#)
To: Szelag.Matthew@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: FW: FW: revised draft agenda for 11/28/12 negotiated rulemaking meeting attached
Date: Monday, November 19, 2012 11:28:43 AM
Attachments: [11-28-12 meeting agenda.docx](#)

From: Niemi, Cheryl (ECY)
Sent: Monday, November 19, 2012 11:28 AM
To: Gildersleeve, Melissa (ECY); Conklin, Becca (ECY)
Subject: FW: FW: revised draft agenda for 11/28/12 negotiated rulemaking meeting attached

FYI see e-mail below for details

From: Macchio.Lisa@epamail.epa.gov [<mailto:Macchio.Lisa@epamail.epa.gov>]
Sent: Friday, November 16, 2012 2:51 PM
To: Don.Essig@deq.idaho.gov
Cc: Chung.Angela@epamail.epa.gov; Niemi, Cheryl (ECY); Kissinger.Lon@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Re: FW: revised draft agenda for 11/28/12 negotiated rulemaking meeting attached

Thanks so much!!!

▼ ---11/16/2012 01:06:06 PM---FYI. No substantive change from what we had drafted a couple weeks ago. Oh well, I tried. Under item

From: <Don.Essig@deq.idaho.gov>
To: Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Angela Chung/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Lon Kissinger/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
Cc: <cnie461@ecy.wa.gov>
Date: 11/16/2012 01:06 PM
Subject: FW: revised draft agenda for 11/28/12 negotiated rulemaking meeting attached

FYI. No substantive change from what we had drafted a couple weeks ago. Oh well, I tried.

Under item 2 we will recap our previous meeting, then go into who commented and the gist of their comments were. We will also speak in a more detail about our quality review of fish consumption studies (requested by Upper Snake River Tribes) and intend to post some information on that prior to the meeting, as soon as I can get to it. We are going to add probabilistic approach (Monte Carlo) to use of point estimates in criteria calculation as a sixth issue to discuss as we move forward.

Under item 3 we will talk about Idaho DEQ's vision of a fish consumption survey – it will be broad, general population, all fish, all sources. From this you can see we are committed to moving forward with an Idaho Survey. Funding is yet uncertain, but it will be contracted in two steps – design and then implementation. We will make the point, our decision I guess you can call it, that we need collect the data in an unbiased way and while the study is being designed and conducted, we can chew on and resolve policy issues that will inform us on how to use that data. Not sure the timing will work out exactly that way, but the point is don't restrict the data collection.

In item 4 will talk about what we want from the committee – prepare for policy discussions, think about not just what their position is but be able to articulate why?

We had for a while thought we'd say that we were going to queue for the next meeting (January 31st, 2013) a

discussion of consumer vs. non consumer and whole population versus sub populations. In the end we decided to see how discussions go under item 3 and take our queue from that on what to address in January's meeting.

From: Paula Wilson

Sent: Friday, November 16, 2012 1:31 PM

To: Barry Burnell; Don Essig; Michael McIntyre; Mary Anne Nelson; Miranda Adams; Douglas Conde

Subject: revised draft agenda for 11/28/12 negotiated rulemaking meeting attached

(See attached file: 11-28-12 meeting agenda.docx)